HQ 1395
.T3

Copy 2

FT MEADE
GenColl

THE WOMAN QUESTION?

ACCORDING TO

MOSES AND PAUL

BY

ISAAC N. TAYLOR.

BOSTON
ARENA PUBLLISHING CO
COPLEY SQUARE
1894

HQ1335
.T3
copy 2

From
American Colonization Society
May 28, 1913.

COPYRIGHTED BY I. N. TAYLOR, 1894.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

To my beloved daughter, Mrs. Esther Taylor Housh, whose life has been given to the cause of Woman, along the lines of the lessons I taught her in childhood, these pages are worthily inscribed.

THE AUTHOR.

THE WOMAN QUESTION

ACCORDING TO MOSES AND PAUL.

Does the Bible deny to women, as women, any of the Rights, or excuse them from any of the Duties, sacred or civil, which pertain to men?

IN attempting to maintain the negative of this question, I shall proceed as the land surveyor and the conveyancer do, — commence at the most

NOTE.—As italics, capitals, punctuation points, etc., are not understood to be divinely inspired, they are my own, throughout these pages, and here used to express more fully my understanding of the text.

prominent point, inclose the premises by definite lines, and end at the place of beginning. This place of beginning is Genesis 1 : 26-28. "And God said : Let us make MAN in our image, after our likeness : And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle and over all the earth. . . . So God created MAN in his own image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them. And God blessed them and and God said unto *them*, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion," etc., as above.

And to emphasize the import

of this peculiar language there is a repetition of it in the beginning of the 5th Chapter, in these still more peculiar terms: "This is the book of the generations of Adam, in the day that God created MAN, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he *them* and blessed *them* and called *their* name ADAM"—in Hebrew, ISH.

Now whether it was from the hint thus divinely given in the name itself, or from his own innate sense of the personal dignity of the fair one beside him, or from the logic of the charter of their common right and duty to subdue the earth, and to have dominion over all things as well as to

multiply and replenish the earth, we need not inquire. But anyway, ISH — the male half of the twain — called the female half of the twain ISHA (the feminine form of the word Ish) thus conceding to her all that the generic name of the race implied. God called *their* name ISH and required them to have dominion. The male half of Ish called the other half Isha simply to distinguish the sex of the one common multiplier, subduer, and dominator of the earth.

Now, all this singular language, without note or comment, should affirm, at once and forever, the following propositions:

1. The generic name of

this dual being — ISH in Hebrew, ANTHROPOS in Greek, HOMO in Latin, MAN in English, and so on through all the tongues of mankind, indicates the full equal dignity, right and destiny of the sexes.

2. This dual being was created in the image, after the likeness of God: that is, neither the male alone nor the female alone represented this similitude, but the two jointly did contain and reflect this image.

3. The simple fact of this divine likeness — the one attribute which, from the beginning, distinguished this species of the creation — constituted the *basis* of their prerogative to subdue and dominate the earth. This is implied and

almost asserted in the inseparable, infrangible links of the chain—God created MAN in his own image; male and female; and said unto *them*, multiply and have dominion.

4. As this Bill of Rights and Program of Duties, thus based on the divine similitude which is elsewhere in the Book alleged to consist in knowledge, righteousness and holiness (see Col. 3: 10, and Eph. 4: 24), issued from the Supreme Author and Ruler to innocent and loyal subjects, any subsequent disloyalty, impairing necessarily this divine image, would modify the relation of the subjects to the Sovereign; and if either of them were primarily or chiefly in transgression, this

would modify their relation to each other, and so the original status of equality would be disturbed and made subject to readjustment at the pleasure of the Sovereign.

5. As a matter of fact, this dual subject did become disloyal and this divine image impaired, though not obliterated, as is evident from such passages as Gen. 9 : 6, and James 3 : 9, 10. Accordingly, the garden of Eden, the original home and ever after the emblem of innocence, ease and pleasure, was forfeited alike to both, and instead thereof was given the wide, wild world, teeming with noxious plants, buzzing with venomous insects, swarming with subtle, sensual

beasts. But the right and duty of replenishing and subduing the earth and holding full sway over all remained unrevoked and unchanged. And in all this ISH and ISHA were still side by side.

6. But alas! She was not only first but chief in transgression. For, without the presence or knowledge of her husband, she yielded to the seductive oratory and sensuous charm of the Prince of all the Pre-Adamic tribes, and so her act was a crime against her husband as well as a sin against her Sovereign. ISH was not deceived (see I. Tim. 2: 14), but followed his fallen ISHA with his eyes open to the consequences. His act was a

sin against his God, but not a crime against his wife. Hence the special penalty incurred by the mother of all living: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception: in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children: And thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." Here is plainly enough implied a disturbance of the original conjugal equilibrium, but it relates only to ISHA as Eve, or mother.

I now advance to the bolder assertion that this original Bill of Human Rights and Program of Human Duties is reaffirmed, amplified, enlightened and glorified throughout the Sacred Scriptures.

Thus the Psalmist (Ps. 8:

3–6) ratifies in almost identical terms the original document: "When I consider thy heavens . . . what is *Man* that thou art mindful of him?" Then comes the answer to this question of awe and wonder: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hand; thou hast put all things under his feet."

Now observe how here, as in the original passage, the generic term *Man* which, as I have shown, includes both sexes, is used, and how also the same sanction of their supreme dominion is alleged, namely, their original place in the scale of

creation. For, instead of the phrases — "in the image and after the likeness of God" — is substituted (their equivalent in the argument) the phrases — "a little lower than the Angels," and "crowned with honor and glory."

And again, that wonderful exposition and amplification of Paul (Heb. 2 : 5–8): "For unto the Angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak ; but one in a certain place (and that place is Ps. 8 : just quoted) testified saying : What is Man that Thou art mindful of him or the Son of Man that Thou visitest him ? Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels, Thou crownedst him with glory

and honor and didst set Him over the works of Thy hand; Thou hast put all things in subjugation under him." Then the Apostle goes on to explain and apply thus: "But now we see *not yet all things* put under him." What! O reverend expounder! Is it some species of fish or fowl or cattle or creeping thing, or some field or forest or mine, or some industrial art or some science, that is not yet put under him — made subject to his masterful genius and his cunning right hand?" No, no," says Paul. "I was speaking of what our great Master called the world to come"— the coming age — the Gospel age. That original document, promulgated in Eden,

was prophetic as well as historic, and it included the whole domain of morals and religion. And when I said: We see *not yet* all things put under *him*. I had my eye on the high plane of conquests yet to be, under the leadership and on account of the sacrifices for all humanity of One who was included originally in the charter of dominion. For, as I was about to say, "We see *not yet all things* put under him, but we see JESUS who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

I have thus reverently inter-

rogated Paul and put his answer into his mouth, because this is evidently his meaning. For, he goes right on to show the real participation of Jesus in human nature, so that, in this capacity as Man, he may be seen and known to be included in that original commission as the Representative of all Humanity, and that the original injunction to subdue and have dominion included all moral and spiritual reforms to the end of time, and that indeed these last are chiefly intended to be accomplished in Christ, that is, in the Christian Kingdom. But in Christ, that is, in His Kingdom — His system of moral control, and including its constituent sub-

jects, its co-workers and its beneficiaries, there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, or, in full, plain, modern phrase, no distinction in matters of privilege, duty, or award, founded on nationality, social condition, or sex.

So, whether we ask the question under discussion at the gate of Paradise or at the door of the Christian Kingdom, the answer is the same, and it is No. From the uprooting of the first thistle just outside the gate of Eden to the final coronation of the King of Kings, nowhere is woman relieved from any service or refused any privilege pertaining to the subjugation of all things, material and

spiritual, to the dominion of knowle lge, righteousness and holiness. But, according to the Book, Ish and Isha shall stand and work and triumph—peer and peeress, hero and heroine, side by side, through all the domains of industrial art, science, religion, society and civil government, until the last reluctant political party shall have yielded to the behests of the Model Man, and the Nations, as Nations, shall have brought their honor and their glory into the Capital City of the confederated Republics of the Planet.

With this exposition of the original document defining human rights and duties, and foreshadowing human destinies, for

which, it will be seen, I am indebted chiefly to Paul, the famous so-called anti-woman's rights man, I might here rest the case. And I would do so but for a few passages which seem to many good people to constitute an amendment of the original charter. One of these is in the immediate context of the great document itself,— so near as to seem to be a part of it. Five others are in the writings of Paul, whose magnificent commentary on the document we have just now considered, and one other is by Peter.

As the whole woman question of the day, so far as the Bible is concerned, depends on the interpretation of these pas-

sages, let us now examine them with care and candor, in the light of those only true rules of interpretation — their harmony with the general tenor of Scripture; the sense of the immediate context; the proper translation of the original terms.

Assuming that my readers have ready access to the Book, I request them to turn to the passages and read them before proceeding further: but if not convenient, read on. Here is the list: Gen. 3: 16; I. Cor. 11: 3–16, and 14: 34–35; Eph. 5: 21–33; I. Tim. 2: 11–15, and I. Pet. 3: 1–7.

The affirmative of our question, which I now propose to refute, assumes that these pas-

sages, each and all, are to be understood in the light of the fact of the original subjection of Eve to Adam. To this I agree. This is the way Paul and Peter put it. Let us all stand in with Paul and Peter. But here we part from the affirmative, abruptly, distinctly, entirely and forever. For it assumes that Eve was, in that whole transaction — the crime and the penalty — the representative of all womanhood throughout all womandom to the end of time, and that Adam was the representative of all manhood throughout all mandom for the same long period. It assumes that the terms are correctly translated from the original; and finally, that by

legitimate inference from all this, the male moiety of society, sacred and civil, has the right to give or refuse, to the female moiety of society, sacred and civil, such privileges as he may please to bestow or withhold.

My first answer is, that no one of these passages refers to woman as woman, but only as wife in her relation to her own husband.

The text to be examined first is Gen. 3 : 16, not only because it is first in the Book, but because it is quoted by Paul and by Peter in every other passage, both for illustration and for authority, in the sacred judicial rulings of these Apostles. Here it is : "I will greatly

multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee."

Now observe that this is not the general penalty inflicted on Adam and Eve alike for the sin of eating the forbidden fruit, whatever that may mean. That penalty was death, whatever that too may mean. But in addition to this judgment against the pair, and which is entailed on all their descendants, not by arbitrary decree, but by the execution of natural law, there was a special penalty assigned to each, manifestly, even to our poor faculties, appropriate to each. In the case

of Adam, the special penalty and the reason for it are plainly announced: "Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife . . cursed be the ground for thy sake," etc., the plain meaning of which is, that whereas, in the former state of innocence and under the shady, fruit-laden bowers of Eden, he and his wife would have had, both about alike, an easy task, now the *brunt* of the outdoor work must fall to *him*, and, toiling and sweating in the hot sunshine, he must make a living for a larger family than otherwise if his wife had not sinned. Respecting the special penalty assigned to Eve the reason is not directly expressed, but I think it fairly implied as

already intimated. I make the supposition with reverence supreme to the Sovereign above, and reverence subordinate to His wise and good servants below. If I am wrong, may they all forgive. The point here made is, that this humiliation of Eve to the rulership of Adam contemplates her in her relation, not to the race at large, not to the outer world, not to society, sacred or secular, but wholly and only to her husband, and that, too, in the experience of her bed-chamber; and it were a miserable mock-modesty if I said less, and an insult to honest interpretation if I said anything different. Enough of this for any ordinary purpose; but so much depends

on the understanding of this passage, which the whole Christian world will finally entertain, that I must add one field-sweeping paragraph, even at the risk of criticism for repetition and unnecessary enlargement: the act of Eve, done without the knowledge, counsel, or consent of Adam, was not only a sin against her Sovereign, but a crime against her husband; while the act of Adam, done with the knowledge, counsel and consent of Eve, though a sin against his Sovereign, was not a crime against his wife; and, therefore, the even balance of the innocent pair was disturbed, incurring justly the special Divine rebuke, and justifying the readjustment made.

And the spirit of this Divine judgment is, that any of the daughters of Eve, to the end of time, who are wives, and who dishonor their marital relations in any way, are justly subject to censure, and it is the right and duty of either church or state, as the case may be, acting as the ordained of God for the punishment of evil doers and the praise of them that do well, to execute a suitable sentence of rebuke. And I shall show, when I come to it, that this is exactly what Paul was doing when he remanded to silence and subjection those Corinthian and Ephesian women. And this brings me, where I am glad to be, to the feet of Paul, who, next to Jesus

of Nazareth, was the grandest man that ever opened his mouth or used a pen, and who, instead of being the crusty old bachelor that some irreverently call him, is still the truest and bravest defender of woman that ever preached a sermon or wrote a book.

The first passages of Paul now to be examined are in I Cor. 11 : 3-16, and 14 : 34–35. The former is too long to quote here. Suffice it to say, the author affirms the truth that "the head of the woman is the man," as our English versions have it, and from this premise he draws some conclusions respecting certain improprieties in the public meetings of the church of Corinth. He endor-

ses the time-honored custom of long hair and hats on for women, and short hair and hats off for men, in public assemblies. It is plainly implied that on this matter of etiquette there were contentions in the public meetings (see v. 16), and herein consisted chiefly the evil which Paul was denouncing; namely, that it made husbands and wives conspicuously antagonistic in public assemblies. The only point I am now making is, that the men here intended were husbands and the women here intended were wives of each other respectively. The manner in which the subject is introduced shows this. The relation existing between the man and

the woman is illustrated and dignified by that existing between God and Christ, and by that existing between Christ and every man — between God the Father and Christ the Son, and between Christ the Head of the whole church and the church His bride, which would include every husband here intended. Now the question is, was any man in that church the head of any woman in that church, unless that woman were that man's wife? Plainly not; and, therefore, it would have been better to translate the terms accordingly. Besides, it is morally certain that in that great city church there were many maids, young and old, and many widows whom

death had freed from the law of their husbands. Had each one of these a head in the person of some man? And note particularly that in v. 9, Paul refers for illustration and for argument to the relation of the first-created pair. Was Adam anything of a head to Eve, only as he was her husband and she his wife?

This prepares us the better to go on now into chapter 14: 34, 35, of the same book: "Let *your* women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to

speak in the church." Here it is plain that the women who are to keep silence in the churches, who are not permitted to speak, and for whom it is a shame to speak in the church, are the same women who are to ask their husbands at home. But what if some of the women who were members of the church or congregation in Corinth had no husbands at home? Plainly they are not here included or even referred to at all, and, therefore, as before, the reference is to women as wives, and to women in no other capacity or relation.

I will skip Eph. 5: 22-33, for the present, and return to it after examining 1 Tim. 2:

8-15: "I suffer not *a* woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over *the* man." This is the old, authorized version. The revised version has it: "I permit not *a* woman to teach nor to have dominion over *a* man, but to be in quietness." The italics are mine.

Take either version, and is the woman who is here forbidden to teach or to usurp authority over *the* man, or to have dominion over *a* man, (whichever way you choose to read it) — is this woman, I ask, any woman who is not a wife?

The appeal of the author, as in the texts 1 Cor.: 11 and 14, to the original case of Adam and Eve, should settle it. "For

Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (V. 13 and 14.) But if this does not settle it, what will you make of v. 15: "Notwithstanding she [this same woman so forbidden] shall be saved in child-bearing," etc. Does not this upset at once the assumption that the term woman in all these Scriptures means woman, *as woman*, and confirm my contention that it means woman only as *wife*?

But some will say, if husbands and wives as SUCH, and they only are intended in these passages, why do they not say so in plain words and thus cut off debate? I answer, sure

enough, why do they not? For the original Greek does say so plainly, that is, it allows the translators to say so plainly, and our translations are misleading. The parallel passage of Paul (Eph. 5) and that of Peter (1 Pet. 3), where the very same subject is under treatment, are correctly rendered. In these places, the Greek term *aner* is translated husband, and the Greek term *gune* is translated wife, every time, as the scope of the context requires, alike in all these passages. Again, while it is true that the Greek word *aner* primarily means an adult male human being, and the Greek word *gune* primarily means an adult female human being, it

is true that these are the words, and the only words, in both secular and sacred Greek to denote husband and wife, although they do not of themselves necessarily have this sense. But they ought to be always so rendered in English, where men and women are manifestly being contemplated in this relation. Why the texts in Corinthians and Timothy are not so rendered it is hardly the part of a humble layman to say. Still the humblest layman may venture to express his disappointment that the revised version follows the the same old groove, and while improving the text in Timothy by leaving out the comma after the word "teach"—an un-

inspired comma which has modified the teachings of theologians for a thousand years — this version, by substituting the article *a* for the article *the*, making it read "over *a* man," instead of "over *the* man," has turned the wheel of revision backward instead of forward. The truth is, there are no articles here in the Greek which require the translator to say necessarily either *a* or *the*. But if *a* is still the indefinite article,and when used at all emphatically is equivalent to *any*, and if the term *woman* means an adult female human being and the term *man* means an adult male human being, then what severe reading this, in the closing days of

the 19th century: "I permit not any adult female to teach or have dominion over any adult male." Why not let Paul say plainly what he means — "I permit not a wife to teach or have dominion over a husband,"— and then let the whole context shed its clear light on that, for there is a clear light emitted from all sides of the wall surrounding these famous texts. Let us see.

All these scriptures were written to c o r r e c t certain abuses in the churches of Corinth and Ephesus — seats of wealth, learning, luxury, and fashion. Some of these abuses affected the peace and dignity of public assemblies and the

proprieties of married people especially. Therefore no one of these passages, nor all of them collectively, can be fairly considered as a general law prohibiting women as women, whether married or unmarried, from participating in the affairs of either church or state.

It lies on the face of these Epistles to the churches of Corinth and Ephesus, and that to Timothy, who was Pastor at Ephesus, that the abuses to be corrected had culminated in disgraceful public antagonisms between husbands and wives, and that in this the wives were chiefly at fault. For, while they were no doubt correct in claiming that the word of God had come to them prominently

(for women the world over are more subject to religious impressions than men), they had pressed to an extreme the Christian doctrine that "In Christ," that is, in the Christian organization, "there is neither male nor female," and they were wrong in claiming that the word should go forth from them in like manner. But however this may be, which is not perfectly clear, it is plain that these wives were defiantly claiming the traditional last word, and so he exclaims: 'What! came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?"

Let no one treat lightly this argument I am making. It is of immense importance to un-

derstand Paul as he intended. Note, then, that he sets out in this letter to the Corinthian church by telling them that he had been credibly informed, though he could only partly believe it, that there were "contentions among them;" that he could not address them as 'spiritual but as carnal," because there was among them "jealousy and strife." Farther on he alleges such gross offences as incest, covetousness, idolatry, slander, drunkenness, extortion, fraud, lawsuits and family quarrels. And it is plainly enough implied that these vices were aired in their public assemblies, some accusing and others excusing, all angry, and wives taking an active part;

even going so far as to usurp authority over their husbands, on the ground that the word of God had come to them chiefly. In this way these wives dishonored their husbands as well as themselves, and so Paul, in his authoritative Apostolic capacity, says to this particular church: "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints. Let your wives keep silence in the churches. . . Let all things be done decently and in order." And in so doing he appeals to the precedent made by a higher court than his, in the case of the first wife of the Adamic race who dishonored her nuptial relation. And it may be added that, as

Eve's discipline was suited to her offence, so was this; for what could possibly be so fit as to require such wives as these to hold their tongues?

The passage in Eph. 5: 22–33, does not seem to have any reference to the relation of husband and wife except as they are viewed in their own home and not in public assemblies, either sacred or secular. It teaches the same doctrine of the headship of the husband and the corresponding subjection of the wife, but there is no allusion even to the comparative rights or obligations of either of them as members of the church or citizens of the commonwealth. But the illustration of this relation, drawn

from that existing between Christ and the church as his Bride, sheds a light on this whole subject, at once more beautiful and sublime than anything else ever written in any other book, in any language of mankind. Let the Rights and Duties of Woman, especially as wife and mother, in her relation to the outer world, to society at large in all its material and spiritual interests, be viewed in the light of the Rights and Duties of the Church in her relation to the same outer world, and the Woman Question is settled.

Paul to Timothy is really Paul to this same church, for Timothy was her pastor — a young man and lately a pupil

of Paul. Substantially the same conditions existed in this church as in that of Corinth. This young pastor was severely tried by the interference of unauthorized teachers, who, in addition to their fables, and endless genealogies, and quibbles which diverted so many from the path of practical godliness into habits of "vain jangling," assumed to be teachers of the law (evidently meaning the moral law), but having such gross conceptions of it as to lead the church into angry disputes. And the result was, as in Corinth, that husbands and wives were brought into conspicuous collision in their public assemblies, especially their prayer meetings.

Whether this bad teaching did in some way lead to this result is not said; but, any way, there was in that high-toned city church a display of millinery and ornament not only in itself unbecoming to humble Christians, but inevitably tending to vanity, envy and strife, such as would lead many wives to humiliate their own husbands. And so, as before, the appropriate discipline had to come.

Now, all these particular disciplinary deliverances, as explained by their immediate contexts and by the spirit of the whole Gospel, are still, like all Scripture, given by inspiration of God, profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for cor-

rection and for instruction in righteousness. But that they may be thus profitable, they must be applied like any other special statutes, in cases similar at least to those which originally called them forth. If the type of feminine Christian millinery and jewelry and of theological and ecclesiastical culture in any of the churches of Boston, New York, or Chicago should decline from what it is in the year of Our Lord 1894, to what it was in Corinth and Ephesus in 59-64, and become, as then, indecently glaring, competitive and arrogant, resulting in angry dialogue and spiteful personality; and if some of the married women in said churches

should, as then and there, so far ignore the proprieties as to antagonize their own husbands in public assemblies on questions of dress or dogma, etiquette or reform, then these Pauline severities would fit, and be authoritative precedents to the rulers of said churches to enjoin the tongues of said married women. But to wrest these Scriptures from their manifest proper function, as specific discipline for offenses actually committed, and make of them a general law subordinating woman as woman in her relations to either church or state, is a monstrous injustice to half the race of Man and to the whole Bible of God. This closes the argument as drawn

from the proper interpretation of the Scriptures in question.

I now proceed to fortify the negative by two propositions. The first is this: A Divine judgment pronounced on any person or class of persons is not to be wilfully prolonged and executed by men upon the same or similar persons or classes. Unto the Woman he said: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband; and he shall rule over thee." Does this authorize husbands the world over to the end of time to compel their wives to be mothers of more children than they desire, no matter

how much sorrow it may cost them?

"A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth." Did this authorize any one to follow Cain, bludgeon in hand, over the earth? Cain seemed to think so, but the Lord set a mark on him to protect him; a mark, not a scar or tattoo, on his forehead, I think, but, let us reasonably presume, that evidence of his GENIUS and enterprise and success which would and did protect him, as the husband of a princess, the daughter of the Chief of the tribe of Nod, the most evolved of all the pre-Adamic tribes, and, with her help, as a famous rancher, and later on, the founder of

the city of Enoch. (See Gen. 4 : 16, 17.)

"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren!" For some reasonably supposed part this boy took in the indignity shown to his grandfather Noah, while lying drunk in his tent, and to show how wicked it is for boys to make fun of poor drunkards, this awful curse was pro nounced. The descendants of Canaan became a mighty people in the land called by the name of this ancestor. It is wonderful how literally and fearfully this curse was visited on a people who apostatized from the religion of Noah. And yet their very enslavers, he Israelites (see Joshua 9:

22–27, and 10: 15–20, and 1 Kings 9: 21, Numbers 33: 55, 56), were punished for enslaving the Canaanites because they did it from evil motives.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the Prophets, . . Behold! your house is left unto you desolate!" (Mat. 23: 37, 38.) These are the compassionate words of the Saviour to those who were clamoring "Crucify Him, Crucify Him: His blood be on us and on our children!" Nothing in all history so fills the mind with awe of the sin-avenging Jehovah like the forlorn experience of this people. But what Christian minister of this age would teach us to abhor a Jew, unless indeed that Jew incurrep our

horror by still flinging scandal at the cross of our Redeemer?

"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle to him and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness." (Hab. 2 : 15.) How generally and how fearfully the Lord finds ways of executing this anathema? About fifty years ago it was my good fortune to be sent from Cincinnati to Columbus, Ohio, as delegate to a State Temperance Convention, in company with the famous Sam Carey, who for half a century was an authority in temperance statistics. In a grand speech on that occasion he affirmed that about nineteen out of twenty of

all the makers and venders of intoxicants in the two Miami Valleys of Ohio, from the beginning to date, had gone or were evidently then going to ruin — financial and moral ruin — and their families with them. But did this authorize any one to set fire to distilleries, warehouses, or saloons, or to allure the sons of those drink-masters through those fatal doors of indulgence which rarely ever open to a returning prodigal?

The other general proposition which clinches my conclusion is this: a Divine Rule, either permitting or forbidding a thing, may become obsolete, null and void by limitation; and that, too, when the limita-

tion is only implied but not expressed. Thus in general, the Patriarchal System was superseded by the Mosaic, and this by the Christian, and so the Christian as it now is, will be by the Millennial. All along the line of religious progress, things typical, ceremonial and judicial, which pertained to time, place, and attainment, come with divine approval and go without special repeal. Examples: Polygamy, Divorce, Slavery, Salutations, Washing of Feet and the Holy Kiss.

Not only the Patriarchs and Ruling Hebrews, but men generally throughout those long economies had more wives than one; some of them had many. When the Gospel first

went abroad to the Gentiles the Jews were everywhere found among them, and churches were organized sometimes of one class chiefly, sometimes of the other, but often of both combined. Many of the converts had more wives than one, and as women, more than men, composed the church membership, many of the members were polygamists. That this relation was not at once made a test and a bar to membership is evident from the fact that an officer — a bishop or a deacon — must be the husband of one wife: he could not, like a private member, have more than one. And yet, this very ruling and the general spirit of Christianity totally

uprooted polygamy in the course of one or two generations. The custom gradually expired, without positive enactment, by the limitations of time and growing intelligence.

The same may be said of slavery. The Hebrew system of servitude did not imply chattel ownership of the bodies and souls of men as the heathen systems did; but the dispersed Jews had everywhere fallen into the same practice. Multitudes of slaveholders in heathen cities embraced Christianity. There is no evidence that the immediate emancipation of their slaves was made a condition of membership in the churches. The fact of the relation of masters and servants

was recognized, but such were the precepts regulating that relation and such the spirit of this higher type of humanity that slavery gradually ceased out of the primitive church. In later centuries, when external Christianity became secularized and corrupted, it regained a footing and maintained it throughout centuries of "irrepressible conflict," which however, has ended forever in its utter extinction. And still it stands in the Book: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear," on the same page with this other: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands" — both alike now obsolete so far as they may have referred to institutions

and usages then existing, but afterwards, in an age of higher attainment, modified into milder precepts, the texts however remaining and forever hereafter to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness."

It was the practice of the Scribes and Pharisees to challenge the opinion of Christ on the disputed questions of their day. Accordingly, it seems rather evident that the Mosaic law of arbitrary divorce had already fallen partly into disuse, before the great Teacher, with one wave of His hand, swept it back from ever entering His system. In one comprehensive sentence He gives

the occasion for the origin and the disuse of that law: "For the hardness of your hearts, Moses wrote you this precept." That is, it was to protect womanhood from the caprice and cruelty of a hard-hearted era that would be succeeded by a more humane age, gradually making obsolete so hard a law.

Let us now pass on from these Old Testament institutions to some in the New which, in like manner, have already become obsolete.

"Salute no man by the way." Why do not Christians obey this precept and refrain from saying "Good Morning" to their neighbors when they pass them in the public roads; Or why rather was that precept ever

given and then put in the Book? Simply because the salutation then in vogue was too formal, too tedious, to be consistent with Christian simplicity, dignity and useful work.

Still there it stands in the Book: "Salute no man by the way." And here is another thing in the Book (John 13: 13--17.) about which not all Christians are agreed. It is the precept for the washing of feet, given by the Master Himself, with unusual emphasis, and enforced by His own example. Why do not Christians everywhere to this day observe this rite? Or, why was it enjoined if not to be perpetual? Simply because the principles of Chis-

tian humility, sympathy and equality were thus inculcated by a custom then and there significant, in a hot and dusty country over which men and women journeyed on foot and shod with only open-work sandals.

"Greet ye one another with a holy kiss." "Greet ye one another with a kiss of charity."

Why has this injunction, originally given by Paul and by Peter and by them written in the same books that say: "Let your women be silent," etc., long since been obsolete and ignored? Because it then sufficiently inculcated, by a custom among men and women alike, the duty of open and impartial Christian recognition and

affection, and it stands in the Book, because the duty then enjoined and only signified by a then present but passing form in society, would never cease to be a duty.

Finally, both Paul and Peter forbid women professing godliness to adorn themselves with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array. By almost universal consent, this has been and is a practically obsolete precept. Why? There is but one true answer: There must have been in those gay cities a special temptation to costly dress and ornament which nothing short of a rigid general rule of restraint would resist. The common effect of some display of wealth and

fashion is bad enough, but sufficient for this is the universal law of humility and self denial. But it lies on the very face of these passages that there was in these city churches such an excessive display of costly ornament as to stimulate as in a hot bed, the growth of pride, vanity, envy, jealousy and strife among the rich; to humiliate the poor; and to mar the beauty of church economy and charity, to an extent conspicious as the bold domineering over their husbands of these same women. So that both these evils. and both at once must be met by a special restraining order from Apostolic headquarters.

Then why will not all Chris-

tian teachers adopt this interpretation? Why do some of them persist in citing these Scriptures as conclusive Divine authority for relegating to silence and inaction, in the affairs of both church and state, not only woman as wife but woman as woman? But they do, and they even prefer the Revised Version and read it triumphantly as follows: "I desire therefore that the men pray in every place," etc. (I Tim. 2: 8.) Then like hounds in their eager chase, leaping the fence without touching it, they skip verses 9 and 10, which treat of this ornament business, and pounce upon verses 11 and 12. "Let a woman learn in quietness with

all subjection; but I permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness."

Be consistent, O learned expounders, and agree that this whole list of texts is of one sort, and being a restraining order directed to the same persons — married women and members of these churches, and including in the same injunction the matter of ornament and the matter of speech a special disciplinary sentence which no one has a right to construe as a general law limiting the rights or duties of women, as women, in their relations to society in general. As covering the whole ground gone over, I now cite

the only remaining Scripture which bears directly on this question. It is the sentence of the Judge on the tempter of Eve; "I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3 : 15.

This, like the other parts of the original record of this momentous transaction, is referred to and explained in the New Testament, and is seen to be a link in the same chain and from its peculiar phraseology evidently the last link and open at one end, to be finally joined to the first, when it shall have been drawn around the whole circle of human history. In

discussing it, I redeem my promise to end at the place of beginning.

The point which I now make is the prominent part here indicated which was originally assigned to woman in that deadly conflict between the powers of Good and Evil which is to end in the triumph of Truth and Righteousness. For by the seed of the woman is meant JESUS the Christ, who almost invariably called himself the Son of MAN; not *a* son of Man; nor son of *a* man; but *the* Son of MAN—the offspring, representative and heir of Humanity Literally, he was the son of Mary and of God, and only "as was supposed," that is, as known

on the sacred and municipal Registry of his native latu: the son of Joseph. (Luke 3: 23.) So that this antagonist of Satan had his participation in humanity only *as the seed of the woman*, and thus to WOMAN was originally given, in a pre-eminent sense, the honor of that subjugation of all things, in its later and higher forms, with which Adam and Eve were jointly charged in the beginning. And as Civil Government or the State is as really a Divine institution as is the family or the church, "the powers that be being ordained of God for the punishment of evil doers and the praise of them that do well," this subjugation implies the purification

and elevation of the politics of the whole world to such a complete extent that, to woman's honor preferably because to Him who is *her Son* pre-eminently, the Alleluia shall be: The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ: And He shall reign forever and ever!

C 239 89

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.
AUG 89
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 015 986 766 3